DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 828 FL 024 467

AUTHOR Stewart, Stuart; Pearson, Lynn
TITLE Development of Communication Strategies among Foreign Language Learners.
PUB DATE Oct 95
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mountain Interstate Foreign Language Conference (Knoxville, TN, October 1994).
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
JOURNAL CIT Mountain Interstate Foreign Language Review; v5 p112-27
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; College Students; *Communication Skills; Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; Intercultural Communication; *Interpersonal Communication; *Native Speakers; Second Language Learning; *Second Languages; Skill Development; *Spanish

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the nature and effectiveness of communication strategies (CSs) used in a negotiation task involving native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs) of Spanish. Subjects were eight university students divided into NS/NNS dyads; the NSs were studying English and the NNSs were studying third- and fourth-semester Spanish. The negotiation task was a role-playing exercise involving a hairstylist (acted by the NNS) and client (NS) attempting to arrange an appointment with conflicting schedules. Interactions were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. Results found CSs used almost equally by NSs and NNSs. CSs identified included appeal for assistance, word approximation, literal translation, self-repair, repetition, clarification request, confirmation check, code-switch, and rephrasing. Some CSs were used by only NSs or NNSs, not both. The success of an interaction was not measurable by the number of CSs used, but by the types, and each dyad showed different CS patterns. Advantages of each CS are discussed briefly. Contains 25 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 828

Development of Communication Strategies Among Foreign Language Learners

Stuart Stewart, *Louisiana State University*
Lynn Pearson, *University of Texas at Austin*

in MIFLC Review, Volume V, pages 112-127.

Abtract. This study examines communication strategies (CSs) in a negotiation task involving native speakers (NSs) and non-native (NNSs) speakers of Spanish. The goal of the research was to identify CSs present in the data and to determine which strategies were most effective. Although the situation was simulated, it resulted in the creation of real discourse. Findings suggest that clarification requests *clearly articulated in the L2* by NNSs coupled with *simplified* rephrasals by NSs contribute to the most successful interactions. Also included are some recommendations for how the teaching of CSs can be implemented in the foreign language classroom.

INTRODUCTION

Communication strategies (CSs) are devices used by speakers to improve the level of communication. Such strategies form an important part of a speaker's linguistic ability, as shown by Swain's model of communicative competence which contains the component of strategic competence (along with grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse competence). According to Swain, strategic competence involves the "mastery of CSs that may be called into action either to enhance the effectiveness of communication or to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting factors in actual communication or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other components of communicative competence" (1984:189).

FL024467

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Leonor A. Ulloa
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although there are many definitions of CSs in the literature (Tarone 1978, 1980, 1981; Bialystok 1983; Bialystok & Fröhlich 1980; Faerch & Kasper 1980, 1983, 1984), Tarone provides a broad explanation that characterizes a CS as "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared" (1981:288). This definition focuses less on a speaker's inability to convey meaning while emphasizing that both speaker and hearer contribute to comprehension.

Previous studies (Tarone 1980, Pica 1988) have identified CSs as ways language learners compensate for their linguistic deficiencies in the target language (TL). However, similar adjustments made by native speakers (NSs) conversing with non-native speakers (NNSs) have tended to be classified as "foreigner talk" as seen in the work of Ferguson and Long. A refreshing departure from this division between NS and NNS strategies is made by Yule & Tarone who argue that NSs do have, as part of their communicative competence, access to a wide variety of CSs. Instead of being the sole provenance of language learners, CSs are seen by these researchers as a bridge between the linguistic knowledge of the learner and that of their TL interlocutor in an actual discourse situation (1990:183).

In this paper we report on a study of the use of CSs by both NSs and NNSs of Spanish in the performance of a negotiation task.[1] The four conversations produced by this task were analyzed to determine (1) what CSs were used by each

conversational participant; (2) whether specific CSs are used solely by NSs or solely by NNSs or whether they are used by both types of speakers; and (3) whether the outcome of a negotiation task can be classified as more or less successful, based on the number and types of strategies used.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. Subjects

The eight participants in this study were students attending Louisiana State University during the summer of 1993: NSs of Spanish were studying English in the English Language and Orientation Program at LSU; NNSs were enrolled in third and fourth semester college Spanish classes. Four mixed pairs of NSs and NNSs were created by the researchers (subsequently referred to as pairs MS, SB, AM, and SC, the letters being randomly assigned to identify the pairs).

B. Task

An open role-play situation was devised that provided roles of hairstylist and client for each pair of participants. Each dyad performed the task with the NNS acting as the hair stylist and the NS acting as the client.

C. Data Collection

Researchers met with participants beforehand and discussed the activity. They explained that the conversations would be

taped and requested that participants leave the tape recorder on until the task was complete. Conversations were later transcribed. NNSs were told to use as much Spanish as possible and not to worry about mistakes. Written instructions were provided to both parties in their native language. Clients were told that they would stop by a hair salon on the way home to make an hour-long appointment for a haircut. Schedules provided to both parties were in total conflict, so participants had to negotiate a solution that required concessions from one or both in order to agree on a mutually convenient time.

The decision to use this type of data collection as a way to elicit communication strategies was based on the observations of several researchers (Tarone 1978; Tarone & Yule 1989; Kasper & Dahl 1991; Yule & Powers 1994). As noted by Kasper & Dahl, even though roles and desired ends had been fixed by the task, the "ensuing interaction would be real" (1991:228). Creating actual discourse with its requirements of turn-taking and spontaneous responses permits insights into "ways in which non-native speakers react to communication difficulties during face-to-face interaction" (Yule & Powers 1994:82); moreover it allows for examination of how native speakers respond to communicative obstacles.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

An in-depth analysis of the four conversations revealed the following:

1) CSs were used by both NSs and NNSs. There was an almost equal number of strategies employed by NSs (38) as by NNSs (41). Strategies identified by the data in this study include the following: (1) appeal for assistance - speaker asks hearer to help determine the proper word or phrase; (2) approximation - speaker uses a phonologically or semantically similar word; (3) literal translation - speaker translates word-for-word from the native language; (4) self-repair - speaker makes a mistake which he/she is able to correct; (5) repetition - speaker repeats what was said by interlocutor; (6) clarification request - hearer asks speaker to repeat what was said, resulting in an exact re-statement of what was said or in a rephrasal of original statement; (7) confirmation check - speaker asks hearer whether a certain statement was made; (8) language switch - speaker resorts to L1 to convey message; (9) rephrasal - speaker finds alternative words or phrases to convey message.

2) Both NSs and NNSs used repetition, clarification requests, confirmation checks and language switch to complete the negotiation task. However, some strategies were restricted to a certain group of users. Only NSs used the strategy of rephrasal. NNSs, with their limited language abilities, augmented their communication efforts with appeals for assistance,

approximations, literal translation and self-repairs (see Tables I & II).

Table I
Number of Communication Strategies Used

Communication Strategy	Used by Non-Native Speaker	Used by NNS and NS	Used by Native Speaker
Appeal for Assistance	3		
Approximation	2		
Literal Translation	2		
Self-repair	3		
Repetition			
by NS		3	
by NNS		7	
Clarification Request			
by NS		7	
by NNS **		10	
Confirmation Check			
by NS		1	
by NNS		5	
Language Switch			
by NS		9	
by NNS		9	
Rephrasal **			18
Total			
by NS	0	20	18
by NNS	10	31	0

** Most successful strategy

Adapted from Tarone (1978) and Long (1983)

Table II
Communication Strategies by Pair of Speakers

	Most Successful ----------> Least Successful			
Comm. Strategy	Pair MS	Pair SB	Pair AM	Pair SC
Appeal for Assistance				3
Approx.	1			1
Literal Transl.			1	1
Self-Repair		1	1	1
Repetition by NS by NNS		1 1	 2	2 4
Clarific. Request by NS by NNS	 3 3	 1	 5	 3 2
Confirm. Check by NS by NNS		 1 1	 4	
Language Switch by NS by NNS			 2	 9 7
Rephrasal	10	2	6	0
TOTAL	17	8	21	33

3) The success of an interaction was not measurable by the number of CSs used. Instead, the choice of particular types of strategies appeared to increase the level of understanding between the two participants. A set of criteria was established by the researchers to determine whether a particular interaction could be characterized as more or less successful. The criteria for success of the interaction are as follows:

(1) **The conversation was carried on mostly in the target language.** The negotiation task required the speakers to use Spanish. Given the wide variation in proficiency levels between NSs and NNSs, some communication problems were expected. Those participants who maintained the use of Spanish through communication strategies and/or other means, fulfilled this requisite of the task. In contrast, those who resorted to English to surmount such difficulties were judged to be less successful in the interactions.

(2) **The native speaker was cooperative in the interaction.** NSs, with their vast linguistic resources, have an array of options available in formulating utterances. The ways that NSs made use of these options factored into the effectiveness of communication. Cooperative strategies used by NSs were seen in the use of repetition and rephrasal. Attentive NSs responded to cues from their NNS interlocutors regarding the comprehensibility of the utterances. NSs deemed to be less cooperative did not reformulate their messages as often and seemed unreceptive to the lack of comprehension experienced by their NNS counterpart.

(3) **The task requirement was met: an hour-long appointment was scheduled.** Instructions given to participants were to schedule an hour-long appointment convenient to both parties; this was the goal of the interaction. The scheduling of the appointment signalled successful completion of the interaction and the end of the conversation.

(4) **The NNS was willing to express non-understanding of any given utterance.** As previously noted, communication breakdowns were an expected part of the interactions. NNSs who signaled their non-comprehension through overt requests for repetition and clarification prevented misunderstanding from continuing unabated over a series of turns. These strategies also indicated to NSs that adjustments in their speech were necessary to increase understanding.

(5) **The NS was willing to rephrase repeatedly until comprehension was achieved.** As stated earlier, cooperation on the part of the NS was a measure of success in the interactions. NSs who continually rephrased their utterances so that the NNS could comprehend the message gave their interlocutors the information needed to further participate in the conversation. Rephrasal strategies were less frequent in the interactions where non-comprehension by the NNS was continual.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Evidence that the use of fewer CSs does not accurately predict the success of an interaction can be seen most clearly in

excerpts from the conversation of pair MS. Even though this pair used seventeen strategies, this conversation was deemed the most successful because it met all of the criteria for success listed above.

Example 1 (pair MS): Approximation @ / clarification request *

Several minor problems were encountered by the NNS (S), but the NS (M) was extremely cooperative.

M: ¿Cuánto?
How much?
@ S: Por veinte dólares ¿propio?
For $20.00, own?
* M: ¿Veinte dólares propina? [NS offers correct form²]
Twenty dollars tip?
S: Sí.
Yes.
M: ¿Más el corto del pelo?
Plus the haircut?
S: Sí.
Yes.

Example 2 (pair MS): Clarification request * / rephrasal + / confirmation check #

There were multiple rephrasals on the part of the NS (M) until she was sure that the NNS (S) understood:

+ M: ¿Cuánto sería en total? La propina más el corto de pelo... ¿cuánto sería en total?
How much in total? The tip plus the haircut? How much in all?
* S: No entiendo.
I don't understand.
+ M: Total. Todo. ¿Cuánto sería por todo? Tengo que pagarle...
Total. Everything. How much for everything? I have to pay you...
S: ¿Total cuesta?
How much does it cost?
+ M: Sí. ¿Cuánto me cuesta? ¿Cuánto me va a costar? Veinte dólares propina ¿más cuánto? ¿Sólo veinte dólares?
Yes. How much does it cost. How much is it going to cost? Twenty dollars plus how much? Only $20?
S: No...treinta.
No...thirty.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

+ M: ¿Treinta?
Thirty?
S: Sí, treinta dólares en total.
Yes, thirty dollars in all.
M: Ah, okay, está bien. Entonces, mañana a las cinco.
Oh, ok, that's good. So tomorrow at 5:00.
S: Sí, señora.
Yes, ma'am.
M: OK. Muchas gracias.
Okay, thanks a lot.
S: Adiós.
Goodbye.

Pair SB used a total of eight CSs. Misunderstanding occurred early in the interaction when the NNS could not understand the NS's question about when he started working in the mornings.

Example 3 (pair SB): Clarification request * / rephrasal +

Four times the NS (S) asked the NNS (B) about hours of operation hoping to secure an early morning appointment. Three times the NNS responded with a question that indicated his non-comprehension.

S: Um hum...A qué hora se empieza a cortar el pelo Ud?
Um hum...What time do you start cutting hair?
* B: ¿Doce y media a una?
From 12:30 until 1:00?
+ S: No...¿A qué hora abren Uds. en la mañana? ¿A qué hora llegan en la mañana?
No...What time do ya'll open in the morning? When do you arrive?
* B: ¿Hora por tu cita?
The time for your appointment?
+ S: Yo tengo libre de ocho a nueve de la mañana. Quizás si Ud. puede cortarme el pelo en la mañana. O ¿a qué hora se abre la peluquería?
I'm free from 8:00 until 9:00 in the morning. Perhaps if you could cut my hair in the morning. Or what time does the shop open?
* B: (Risa). Uh,...okay, pero ¿tú corta tu pelo para una hora?
(Laughter). Uh...okay, but doe you cut your hair for an hour?
S: Sí.
Yes.

The NS's inital attempt at negotiating a settlement failed, resulting in a solution that did not totally conform to the original requirements of the task.

Example 4 (pair SB): Proposed solution

The NS (S) finally suggested coming in a little early the next afternoon (at 3:00) in hopes that the NNS's (B) 2:30 appointment would either fail to show up or be finished early. Otherwise, he said that they would have to finish in 1/2 hour as opposed to the original hour needed for the appointment.

S: Bueno. Yo tengo de las tres a cuatro libre. Voy a tratar de llegar a las tres o si estás libre si acaso no llega tu cita anterior para ver si de tres a cuatro me cortas el pelo. Si no de tres y media a cuatro. ¿Sí?
Good. I'm free from 3:00 until 4:00. I'll try to get here at three or if you're free because maybe your earlier appointment doesn't show up to see if you can cut my hair between 3:00 and 4:00. If not, then from 3:30 until 4:00. OK?
B: Sí.
Yes.

Evidence that the mere presence of clarification requests and rephrasals is no guarantee of success is best illustrated by examples from pair AM who used twenty-one strategies. Although there were numerous clarification requests on the part of the NNS and multiple rephrasals by the NS, much of the conversation remained incomprehensible to the NNS because rephrasals often contained more complex structures and vocabulary than original statements.

In one instance, the client (NS) insisted on giving her name:

Example 5 (pair AM): Clarification request * / rephrasal + / self-repair %

The NS (A) insisted upon giving her name to the NNS (M). His lack of undertanding was complicated by her difficult rephrasals:

A: Tengo que dar mi nombre...
I have to leave my name...
* M: ¿Cómo? ¿Por favor?
What? Please?
\+ A: Ud. necesita mi nombre. Tengo que dar mi dato para la cita de mañana. Mi nombre...
You need my name. I have to leave my name for my appointment tomorrow. My name...
* M: ¿Tu nombre? Ah, yo no tengo...¿cómo?
Your name? Oh, I don't have...what?
\+ A: Mi nombre es A. P. para la cita de mañana, ¿eh?
My name is A. P. for the appointment tomorrow, eh?
* M: Es no bueno. Yo hablo poco español. Yo vive en Phoenix, poco. That's all. ¿Es posible yo corto tu pelo, eh,
% tres y treinto, treinta?
This is not good. I speak little Spanish. I live in Phoenix a little while. That's all. It is possible for me to cut your hair at 3:30?

Another time the client wanted to know if confirmation of the appointment was required.

Example 6 (pair AM): Clarification request * / rephrasal + / language switch =

The NS (A) asked repeatedly if she needed to call the next day to confirm the appointment. Her complex rephrasals impeded comprehension by the NNS (M) once again.

\+ A: ¿No hay necesidad que yo llame antes por teléfono para reconfirmar? ¿No es necesario?
Don't I need to call to reconfirm? Isn't it necessary?
* M: Está, no comprendo. No sé.
I don't understand. I don't know.
\+ A: Eh, por la mañana, ¿no tengo que llamar, de nuevo, para confirmar mi-, mi cita? ¿No es necesario?
Uh, in the morning? Don't I need to call again to confirm my appointment? Isn't it necessary?
= M: Damn.
Damn.
A: No, no.
No, no.

At one point the NS gave the NNS exact words to say:

Example 7 (pair AM):

A: Tú dime, dime << No, ya está comfirmada su cita para mañana.>>
You tell me, tell me -- No, your appointment for tomorrow is already confirmed.

Changes in intonation and a switch in the role of the NS from conversational partner to conversational manager prompted researchers to consider this interaction a highly frustrating experience for both parties.

Pair SC was markedly unsuccessful. The low proficiency of the NNS created the need for thirty-three CSs, as well as extensive use of English by both parties. A rather inappropriate solution (i.e., splitting up the appointment into half-hour time slots) proposed by the NNS was rejected by the NS. The NS subsequently offered to rearrange his work schedule so that the appointment could be made.

Example 8 (pair SC): Confirmation check # / language switch = / clarification request *

The first solution offered by the NNS (S) was that the appointment be divided into two 1/2-hour segments:

= S: Uh, I was going to try to say, how you, we could split up an hour.
=, # C: Split up?
= S: I don't know. Like when you come for thirty minutes and come back for thirty minutes.
C: Ah, puede ser. Pero, ¿a qué hora? Yo tengo libre, free, de once a doce.
Oh, it could be. But what time? I'm free, free from 11:00 until 12:00.
S: De doc-, de doce...
From twelve, from twelve...
C: Uh-huh.
S: Y a nueve. Y, um, tres treinta.
And at nine. And, um 3:30.

C: De doce. ¿A qué hora tienes libre? De doce a ...
From 12:00. What time are you free. From 12:00 til...
S: Doce y doce treinta y tres treinta.
12:00 and 12:30 and 3:30.
C: ¿Tres treinta? Bien.
3:30? That's good.
S: Sí.
Yes.
C: Tres treinta.
3:30.
S: Treinta minutos.
Thirty minutes.
= C: Pues, ¿me puedes cortar el pelo in half an hour and then half an hour?
Well, can you cut my hair in half an hour and then half an hour?
= S: Okay.
Okay.
C: ¿No, no es problema?
No, it's not a problem?
S: No.
No.
C: Si me lo cortas...
If you cut it for me...
S: Sí.
Yes.
C: Un lado...
One side...
S: Sí.
Yes.
C: En media hora...
In half an hour...
S: Okay.
Okay.
= C: and then I, yo me voy y luego el otro lado, la otra media hora.
and then I, I leave and then the other side in the other half hour.
= S: Sí, okay.
Yes, okay.
C: Me voy a ver chistoso en la calle, ¿eh?
I'm gonna look funny on the street, no?
* S: ¿Cómo?
What?
C: La gente se va a reír de mí, si me ve con un lado cortado y el otro lado /... sin cortar.
People are gonna laugh at me, if they see me with one side cut and the other side...uncut.
= S: /Right Sí.
Yes.

Later on, the NS (C) offered a more reasonable solution:

Example 9 (pair SC): Language switch =

Then, because the NS (C) refused to accept the proposal of the NNS (S) and saw her low-level proficiency as an insurmountable barrier, he offered to rearrange his work schedule to accomodate her and terminate the interaction.

C: Mejor, mejor que nos vemos a las nueve.
It's better, better that we see each other at 9:00.
S: Ah, sí.
Oh, yes.
C: De nueve, de nueve a diez.
From 9:00, from 9 until 10.
S: Sí.
Yes.
= C: And I'm gonna, yo cambio mi horario del trabajo.
And I'm gonna, I'll change my work schedule.
S: Okay.
Okay.
C: Muy bien.
Very well.
S: Okay.
Okay.
C: ¿Sí? ¿Te parece bien?
Yes? Does that seem OK to you?
S: Sí.
Yes.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined four conversations between NSs and NNSs of Spanish. While acknowledging limitations due to the small number of subjects and the requirements of the negotiation task, we believe that results suggest that certain types of CSs can be a valuable aid to communication. The most successful interaction (MS) revealed that clarification requests **clearly articulated in the target language** by the NNS coupled with rephrasals **in a more simplified form** on the part of the NS were the most effective CSs. But others were effective as well.

Repetition as a strategy may initially be considered rather uninteresting. However, repetition can, in fact, be used to accomplish a variety of communicative acts. These data reveal instances of NS repetition to reinforce comprehensible input, to provide corrective feedback and to initiate negotiations over meaning. NNS repetition was used to signal to a NS that the NNS's thoughts exceeded the NNS's linguistic ability to express them or to indicate that the requisite meaning was not conveyed (Knox 1994:196ff). Repetition was used by NNSs both as a production strategy to "buy time" to formulate the next utterance and as a communication strategy to have another chance to process the information (Tarone & Yule 1987).

Language switch may be considered by some to be a form of abandoning an attempt to use the L2, but resorting to the L1 can also be seen as "a normal psychological process that facilitates second language production and allows the learners both to initiate and to sustain verbal interaction" (Brooks & Donato 1994:268). On a limited basis language switch can prove to be a useful interactional tool (perhaps for use as discourse markers or processing aids), but overuse of this strategy is certainly detrimental to a successful L2 interaction (as pair SC's interaction shows).

Clarification requests and confirmation checks offer both NSs and NNSs a second chance at processing. Hearers who ask for additional information prompt speakers to re-utter, hopefully in manner more intelligible to them. However, rephrasals can be a

double-edged sword for both speakers and hearers. NNSs may be reluctant to ask for clarification in certain situations. And, as Hatch notes, NSs sometimes find it difficult to rephrase some of their utterances in ways that will allow NNSs to respond appropriately (1978:420). Furthermore, for a variety of reasons, NSs may choose not to respond to particular interactional difficulties.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This study has important implications for language teaching. CSs can enhance communicative ability, and providing assistance to learners in accessing CSs may aid them in their quest for L2 proficiency. As these strategies form part of the overall communicative competence of all NSs, many of them are applicable for use by learners in the TL as well.

While there exists little disagreement over the fact that CSs allow learners to bridge the gap between what they are capable of expressing and what they want to express, there seems to be some debate over whether CSs should be overtly taught. Those who follow Faerch & Kasper's reasoning see the teaching of CSs as helpful because it shows learners how to choose the most effective strategy in a given situation "to compensate for insufficient linguistic resources by using the totality of their communicative resources creatively and appropriately" (1980:108). Those who oppose the teaching of CSs (e.g. Labarca & Khanji) contend that communicative ability increases "precisely when students make less us of CSs" (1986:78). Still others who see a correlation between effective use of CSs and level of proficiency and/or task type (e.g. Bialystok & Fröhlich 1980; Paribakht 1985) view CSs as a natural consequence of increasing proficiency. These researchers believe that as learners progress they become more capable of using L2-based strategies (e.g. approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, appeals for assistance) and of making the most efficient use of strategies chosen.

We strongly believe in providing students at all levels with access to any and all tools that foster interactional ability. The teaching of CSs does precisely that by enhancing students' awareness of alternative means of keeping a conversation going. Because NSs and NNSs alike sometimes become frustrated in their efforts to communicate, it is incumbent upon teachers to equip students with CSs. Learners with access to these tactics will be

more at ease when attempting to function in the L2. Also, experience in using the L2 in actual discourse situations has been shown to be important in the development of later oral fluency (Horowitz 1986). Presentation of the most successful strategies combined with in-class practice offers learners the opportunity to expand their communicative resources despite linguistic deficiencies (cf. Faerch & Kasper 1980; Berry-Bravo 1993). Information gap activities, negotiation tasks and actual pairings with NSs offer learners a variety of ways in which to employ CSs.

As Bialystok declares, the best strategies are those "based in the TL and [that] take account of the specific features of the intended concept" (1983:116). In order to take advantage of these best strategies, students should be encouraged to maintain interactions as much in the L2 as possible and to devise alternative ways of using the L2 to express an unknown idea. Furthermore, whenever NNSs do not understand their interlocutor they should ask for clarification (also in the L2). Signalling non-understanding, although it interrupts the flow of conversation, "makes previously unaccepted input comprehensible" (Gass and Varonis 1985:161).

When requests for clarification are made, NSs should simplify their utterance or rearrange the flow of information in order to avoid erecting even more barriers to communication. Simple repetition with minimal syntactic adjustment tends to provide little assistance to interlocutors who did not understand

the first time. On the other hand, breaking utterances down into smaller chunks that highlight key words or phrases or fronting the most salient information can enhance the success of an interaction. Cooperation is important on both sides.

Striving for successful L2 interactions and being willing to do what it takes to accomplish that goal are two different things. A successful conversation is an interactional achievement that rests on a speaker's ability to "engage his conversational partner in cooperative efforts" (Knox 1994:196). NNSs and NSs alike should be aware that a combination of patience and perseverance will guarantee a more fruitful conversational experience for both parties.

NOTES

1 Special thanks to George Yule for his assistance in devising the negotiation task used in this study.

2 Our analysis of this excerpt within the larger context of the conversation led us to the assumption that the NNS was trying to say the word propina when she said propio with rising intonation. However, this was not confirmed with her, so it is possible that she had another word in mind. Although the idea of a $20 tip on a $10 haircut might seem odd, knowing the problems that NNSs have with numbers contributes to our conclusion that this was the intended utterance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge Jill Brody, Hugh Buckingham, George Yule, Jaan Ingle Troltenier, Dale Koike and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

WORKS CITED

Berry-Bravo, Judy. "Teaching the Art of Circumlocution." Hispania 76.2(1993):371-377.

Bialystok, Ellen. "Selection and Implementation of Communication Strategies." Ed. Faerch and Kasper, Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman, 1983.

----- and Maria Fröhlich. "Oral Communication Strategies for Lexical Difficulties." Interlanguage Studies Bulletin 5(1980):3-30.

Brooks, Frank and Richard Donato. " Vygotskyan Approaches to Understanding Foreign Language Learner Discourse During Communicative Tasks." Hispania 77.4(1994):262-274.

Faerch, Claude and Gabrielle Kasper. "Two Ways of Defining Communication Strategies." Language Learning 34.1(1984):45-63.

----- "Plans and Strategies in Foreign Language Communication. Ed. Faerch & Kasper, Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman, 1983.

----- "Processes and Strategies in Foreign Language Learning and Communication." Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht 5(1980):47-118.

Ferguson, Charles. "Toward a Characterization of English Foreigner Talk." Anthropological Linguistics 17(1975): 1-14.

Gass, Susan and Evangeline Varonis. "Task Variation and Nonnative/Nonnative Negotiation of Meaning." Eds. Gass and Madden, Input in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1985.

Hatch, Evelyn. "Discourse Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. Ed. E. Hatch Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings, 401-435. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1978.

Horowitz, Elaine. "Some Language Acquisition Principles and Their Implications for Second Language Teaching." Hispania 69.3(1986):684-689.

Kasper, Gabrielle and Merrill Dahl. "Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics." Studies in Second Language Acquisition 13(1991):215-247.

Knox, Laurie. "Repetition and Relevance: Self-Repetition as a Strategy for Initiating Cooperation in Nonnative/Native Speaker Conversation." In Ed. B. Johnstone, Repetition in Discourse - Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Vol I:195-207. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1994.

LaBarca, Angela and Rajai Khanji. "On Communication Strategies: Focus on Interaction." Studies in Second Language Acquisition 8(1986):68-79.

Long, Michael. "Linguistic and Conversational Adjustments to Non-Native Speakers." Studies in Second Language Acquisition 5(1983):177-194.

Paribakht, T. "Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency." Applied Linguistics 6(1985):132-146.

Pica, Teresa. "Interlanguage Adjustments as an Outcome of NS-NNS Negotiated Interaction." Language Learning 38(1988):45-73.

Swain, Merrill. "Large-scale Communicative Language Testing: A Case Study." Eds. S. Savignon and H. Berns, Initiatives in Communicative Language Teaching. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1984.

Tarone, Elaine. "Conscious Communication Strategies in Interlanguage: A Progress Report." Eds. H. Brown, C. Yorio and D. Crymes, On Tesol 77: Teaching and Learning in ESL. Washington, DC: TESOL 1978:194-203.

----- "Communication Strategies, Foreigner Talk and Repair in Interlanguage." Language Learning 30(1980):417-431.

----- "Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy." TESOL Quarterly 15(1981):285-295.

Tarone, Elaine and George Yule. Focus on the Language Learner. Oxford: University Press, 1989.

----- "Communication Strategies in East-West Interactions." Ed. L. Smith, Discourse Across Cultures. New York: Prentice Hall, 1987:49-65.

Yule, George and Maggie Powers. "Investigating the Communicative Outcomes of Task-Based Interaction." System 22(1994):81-91.

Yule, George and Elaine Tarone. "Eliciting the Performance of Strategic Competence." Ed. Scarcella, Andersen and Krashen, Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language. New York: Newbury House, 1990:179-194.

Appendix I: The Task

HAIR STYLIST

You are a hair stylist. A customer comes in to make an appointment. Check your schedule to see if you have an opening (at least one hour).

9:00 ----------

9:30 ----------

10:00 -------Appointments----------

10:30 -------Appointments----------

11:00 -------Appointments----------

11:30 -------Appointments----------

12:00 ----------

12:30 ----------

1:00 -------Lunch----------

1:30 -------Lunch----------

2:00 ----------

2:30 -------Appointments----------

3:00 -------Appointments----------

3:30 ----------

4:00 -------Appointments----------

4:30 -------Appointments----------

5:00 ----------

CUSTOMER

You need a haircut. On the way home from work, you stop by a hair salon to make an appointment. Here is your schedule for the next day. Arrange a time (at least one hour) when you can get your hair cut.

It is very important that you get this appointment on this particular day because you are leaving on a business trip the next day.

9:00 -------Work----------

9:30 -------Work----------

10:00 -------Work----------

10:30 -------Work----------

11:00 ----------

11:30 ----------

12:00 -------Lunch with best friend----------

12:30 -------in town for this day only----------

1:00 -------and this is his/her only free time----------

1:30 -------Work----------

2:00 -------Meeting with boss----------

2:30 -------Meeting with boss----------

3:00 ----------

3:30 ----------

4:00 -------Appointment with----------

4:30 -------company doctor----------

5:00 ----------

PELUQUERO/A

Usted es peluquero/a. Un cliente llega a su peluquería para fijar una cita. Mire su horario para una hora libre.

9:00 ----------

9:30 ----------

10:00 -------Cita----------

10:30 -------Cita----------

11:00 -------Cita----------

11:30 -------Cita----------

12:00 ----------

12:30 ----------

1:00 -------Almuerzo----------

1:30 -------Almuerzo----------

2:00 ----------

2:30 -------Cita----------

3:00 -------Cita----------

3:30 ----------

4:00 -------Cita----------

4:30 -------Cita----------

5:00 ----------

CLIENTE

Usted necesita cortarse el pelo. Después del trabajo, va a una peluquería para fijar una cita. Abajo está sus horario del próximo día. Fije una cita (por una hora a lo menos) cuando puede cortarse el pelo.

Es muy importante que se corte el pelo en este día porque va a salir mañana en un viaje de negocios.

9:00 -------Trabajo----------

9:30 -------Trabajo----------

10:00 -------Trabajo----------

10:30 -------Trabajo----------

11:00 -------Trabajo----------

11:30 ----------

12:00 -------Almuerzo con mejor amigo/a----------

12:30 -------que va a pasar por la ciudad----------

1:00 -------y ésta es su único tiempo libre----------

1:30 -------Trabajo----------

2:00 -------Reunión con el jefe----------

2:30 -------Reunión con el jefe----------

3:00 ----------

3:30 ----------

4:00 -------Cita con el doctor----------

4:30 -------de la compañía----------

5:00 ----------